

Claim 8 recites that the intangible property interest is an interest in an intellectual property asset (*see* page 4, line 24), and Claim 9 recites that the intellectual property asset is patent; trademark; or copyright (*see* page 2, line 20); claim 10 recites that the intangible property interest includes license; lease; easement; and goodwill (*see* page 2, lines 20-24), claim 11 recites that the right includes a bundle of rights with respect to a person, place or a thing (*see* page 2, lines 20-24), claim 11 recites various types of rights traded, such as right to a unit of service; right to income from a unit of service; right to the use of an object; right to income from an object; right to the use of a place; right to income from a place; right of way; right to navigate along a route; right to use of genetic information; right to income of a person for a period of time; right to a person's time; right to a person's ability, image or likeness; right to bring lawsuit against a party; right to collect a payment from a party; right to profits from a partnership; right to exclude an entity from making, using, selling, or importing a product; and right to exclude an entity from making, using, selling, or importing a product made of a method. (*see* page 2, lines 23-24; page 3, line 20-page 5, line 20).

Claim 13 recites that the intangible property interest is an interest derived from a second intangible property interest. (*see* page 4, line 25 – page 5, line 2), and claim 14 recites that the interest was a share of a second intangible property interest. (*see* page 4, lines 12-13). Claim 15 is directed toward displaying the identifier or a description of said intangible property interest, and claim 16 is directed toward inviting a seller to register an intangible property interest, (*see* page 2, line 19), and claim 17 is directed toward registering an intangible property interest. *Id.* Claim 18 is directed toward computing the price of said intangible property interest (*see* page 13, lines 14-24) and claim 19 recites that the price is computed using Black-Sholes formula (*see* page 13, lines 22-23). Claim 20 is directed toward displaying an ask price for an intangible property interest, *see* page 14, line 22, and claim 21 is directed toward matching the bid with an ask price, *see* page 14 line 23-24. Claim 22 is directed toward offering a share in an intangible asset for sale. *See* page 13, line 2. Claim 23 is directed toward an electronic marketplace implemented on a programmed computer coupled to a communication network. *See* page 11, lines 23-24.

Independent claims 24 and 29 are variations of the claims described above, and therefore are supported by the specification as shown above. The dependent claims are similar to the dependent claims 8-23, except that they are directed toward shares of intangible property interests.

Addressing separate issues of patentability

The second ground mentioned in the Office action is directed toward 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(6) concerning the need to address separate issues of patentability for each of the Claims asserted to stand and fall separately with citations of the authorities, statutes and parts of the record relied on as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(8).

Under the new rules, instead of presenting a statement of issues for review, a concise statement listing each ground of rejection, e.g., "Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by X" is required. See 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi). Applicant has already presented the issues in the manner specified under this rule.

Requirement for Grouping of the Claims

The third ground for objection in the Office Action concerned the grouping of the claims. But under the new rules of practice, it appears that the requirement for grouping claims has been abolished. Under new 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii), when an appellant argues as a group multiple claims subject to the same ground of rejection, the Board may select a single claim from that group of claims and treat its disposition on that claim as applying to all claims in the group. An appellant's failure to argue separately claims that the appellant has grouped together constitutes a waiver of any argument that the Board must consider the patentability of any grouped claim separately.

Appendix

New Rule § 41.37(c)(1)(ix) requires an appendix listing any evidence relied on by the appellant in the appeal, together with a statement setting forth where the evidence was entered in the record by the Examiner. This is not required in the Office Action, and moreover, there is no evidence other than case law that Appellant relied on. Therefore this is not provided in this response.